

March 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6439

New Mexico congressional delegation, I would like to extend an invitation to the Members of the Senate to attend this auspicious occasion.

REBECCA LATIMER FELTON, FIRST WOMAN U.S. SENATOR

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the first woman to serve in the Senate of the United States was a Georgian. She was Mrs. Rebecca Latimer Felton, who was born near Decatur, Ga., and who was very active during her lifetime in political affairs of the State.

There appeared in the March 23 edition of the Atlanta Journal a column written by Mrs. Bernice McCullar, one of the State's most noted educators and historians, which traces the life and career of Rebecca Felton and recounts the circumstances of her being appointed to serve in the Senate, thereby becoming the first woman to sit in this body.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. McCullar's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGIA NOTEBOOK: FIRST WOMAN IN U.S. SENATE GOT ASSIST FROM GEORGE

(By Bernice McCullar)

You never can tell what will happen at commencement.

A 17-year-old honor graduate in Georgia, many years ago, married the commencement speaker, and teamed up with him to upset political tradition in Georgia and set old and staid politicians quaking in their boots.

Rebecca Latimer Felton also went on to become the Nation's first woman U.S. Senator. For 1 day.

She had been born in Decatur in 1835. Her father, the postmaster, read the newspaper when it came in by stagecoach, to the villagers. She listened, little dreaming that one day thousands of Georgians, in the remotest rural areas, would be eagerly awaiting the mailman bringing the newspaper that contained her own column.

She went to Madison Female Academy, graduating in 1852. The speaker she married in 1853 was Dr. W. H. Felton of Cartersville, also a farmer. They farmed in Etowah Valley, had a newspaper, lost their first two babies, refugee before Sherman, and buried two more babies from a shack near Macon.

They returned to their valley just before the bloody battle of Chickamauga, where 37,000 Americans were killed or wounded. She helped nurse them while her husband doctored. Seeing them gave her a lifelong horror of war.

In 1874, when Georgia was revolting against the "Bourbon cliques," Felton decided to run for Congress. She helped him. They made fun of her. One editor printed this jingle:

"Some parsons hide behind their coat
To save their precious life;
But Parson Felton beats them all;
He hides behind his wife."

But another editor wrote, "Thank God for her. We need more wives helping their husbands bear the burdens of life."

The Feltons crusaded against the convict lease system under which big planters and mine owners were able to rent convicts for a dime a day. Three companies in which powerful politicians owned stock, leased hundreds for 20 years, agreeing to pay the State \$50,000 in 20 annual instalments.

The Feltons also crusaded against liquor and for women's rights. He won. Later, he lost his congressional seat, but went to the

Georgia Legislature. The Feltons helped unseat the regular Democrats and elect a farmer (William Northen, of Hancock County) Governor.

After the doctor died, Hoke Smith, who owned the Atlanta Journal, hired the 65-year-old widow to write a column in his paper. She wrote it from 1899 to 1920. She kept a horse and rider near her door to send the copy to the train when necessary.

Her column became enormously popular. Georgians wrote her about everything from advice to the lovelorn to which candidate to vote for. One man who had 78 grandchildren wrote her about how to rear them.

She became the most powerful and influential woman in Georgia. Tom Watson was her friend and colleague, though sometimes they disagreed.

She had an opinion—some people called it meddling—about everything under the sun. She crusaded for diversified crops, lower prices on fertilizer, less debt, and more sobriety. She defended lynching.

She opposed Wilson and the League of Nations. She helped elect Tom Hardwick Governor and Tom Watson senator. Hardwick appointed her, at 87, as U.S. Senator. The gallant Walter George, named to the regular term, stood aside for a day so she could make history: The first woman in the U.S. Senate.

Said she, "The women of this Nation have cause to rejoice this day. A door that was closed to them has been opened." She came back home to Cartersville, died in 1930, at 95. Not many people remember her. She would be annoyed at that. Once her name was on every tongue, a household word in Georgia. Thus with mortal fame.

DODGE CITY AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an article which I believe merits the attention of all of us who are here to serve and represent the people of these United States.

Because it tells of the impact of our involvement in southeast Asia on the everyday life of Dodge City, Kans., it may perhaps be more personally meaningful to those of us who represent that great State in the heart of our Nation. But, Mr. President, the impact of Vietnam on Dodge City is the impact of Vietnam on towns and cities throughout this country. As the article's headline states, "Dodge City Illustrates War's Growing Impact at Grassroots Level."

In citing, for instance, the reaction of the townspeople to the death of Sgt. Frank Sanchez, Jr., a helicopter crew chief hit by Vietcong fire, it relates:

The soldier hadn't lived here for 10 years and few people remembered him. But the funeral mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was packed and flags with mourning streamers flew all over town. "All at once Frank was everybody's buddy."

Reported here are instances of reactions to shortages, delivery difficulties, the draft—some petty, some noble—all human.

The one topic on which I receive the most mail is our Vietnam commitment. The same, I am confident, holds true for every office on both sides of Capitol Hill. I have been trying, and I am sure others have been, reading these letters and trying to answer them as time permits. It is not easy. I cannot answer all the questions. It is not always enough to explain

why we are there or the importance of honoring our commitments. People are concerned, and deeply concerned, I believe, because they are confused by earlier optimistic pronouncements from the administration and by unclear policy and seemingly indecisive performance in southeast Asia.

It is not my intention to suggest any solutions. Let me simply say that this article made a deep impression on me and, in urging my colleagues to read it, I ask unanimous consent that "Vietnam's Shadow: Dodge City Illustrates War's Growing Impact at Grassroots Level," by Everett Groseclose be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1966]

VIETNAM'S SHADOW: DODGE CITY ILLUSTRATES WAR'S GROWING IMPACT AT GRASSROOTS LEVEL—ITS 14,000 RESIDENTS WORRY ABOUT DRAFT, SHORTAGES, MOURN VICTIM OF VIETCONG—HARD-TO-GET GUITAR STRINGS

(By Everett Groseclose)

DODGE CITY, KANS.—The jungles of Vietnam are approximately 9,500 miles from this "cowboy capital" on the monotonous Kansas plains. But the war isn't a remote skirmish to Dodge's 14,000 residents.

"Six months ago it was inconceivable that we would ever feel Vietnam's effect here," drawls First National Bank President Dean R. Young. "But now we're getting one jolt after another."

One jolt came last month. Sgt. Frank Sanchez, Jr., became the town's first Vietnam casualty when the helicopter on which he was crew chief was hit by Vietcong fire. The soldier hadn't lived here for 10 years and few people remembered him. But the funeral mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was packed and flags with mourning streamers flew all over town. "All at once Frank was everybody's buddy," says a boyhood chum, Robert E. Campbell.

BEATING THE DRAFT

Death, however, isn't the only thing that's bringing the war closer. Talks with scores of Dodge's citizens make clear that Vietnam is rapidly sifting down to grassroots America in all sorts of ways. Local merchants and manufacturers cope with late deliveries and manpower shortages that they attribute to the Asia war. Younger men play a new "game"—how to beat the draft. And some businessmen fear the war's cost will mean a tax boost soon.

"It's Korea all over again," laments Burell Rice, head of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.'s Dodge City district.

Take a stroll through downtown Dodge, where narrow red brick streets still remind a visitor of the raw frontier town it once was, and where three automobiles can create a traffic jam. At Jay P. Scholle's cafeteria on Gunsmoke Street (named for TV's "Gunsmoke," whose locale is Dodge) coffee-break conversation turns as often to Vietnam as to cattle prices and the paucity of rainfall.

Confusion abounds over certain points of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. But advocates of a U.S. pullout are hard to find. "We may not understand everything that's going on," says Bill Ridgway, executive director of the local chamber of commerce, "but we're certainly patriotic."

SO MAD I COULD SPIT FIRE

The local Elks Club has mounted a write-a-soldier campaign; for a while, it listed in the Dodge City Daily Globe the names and addresses of the area's soldiers serving in Vietnam and urged citizens to write them letters of encouragement and support. Mrs. Richard E. Speirs, a physician's wife, orga-

nized her church circle and bridge club to send packages of food, toiletries, and candy to men fighting in Vietnam. "We just can't do enough for those soldiers," says Mrs. Speirs, whose daughter is married to an Army paratrooper. "The attention those draft card burners have gotten makes me so mad I could spit fire."

But "patriotism" takes several forms around Dodge City.

Students at the town's two small colleges recently donated 200 pints of blood for the wounded in Vietnam, twice the goal, but most of the males are showing an uncommon seriousness toward their school work—apparently to lessen their chances of being snatched by the draft. The Dodge City High School junior class recently sent packages to GI's in Vietnam but at the moment, says class sponsor Helmut Schmeller, who also teaches foreign languages, "the biggest concern is with the junior-senior prom—not Vietnam."

The local Ford dealer, H. M. Skaggs, Jr., complains that military priority on truck production is cramping his operation. "I've had five four-wheel-drive pickups on order for periods ranging from 30 to 60 days," he says, "and I still don't have an inkling of when to expect them." Park Eckles, a partner in Eckles Department Store, says: "6 months ago we could get delivery on bed-sheets in a month; now it's taking 4 months because so many are going to the Government."

DAMNED IRRITATED CUSTOMERS

Over at Harms' Music Store, owner Howard B. Harms tells how some customers "get damned irritated" when he explains that Vietnam war demands are delaying orders. "Lightweight guitar strings are almost impossible to get; it's the same type of wire used in instruments for jet planes," Mr. Harms says. "And oboes—I've had seven on order for 6 months." The silver used in the musical instrument's keys "is the same material used in the firing pins of some rifles," he adds. A nearby high school band which ordered three copper kettle drums from Mr. Harms gave up after waiting 6 months for delivery; it got prompt action on plastic substitutes.

The most noticeable pinch, however, comes from the military's ever-growing manpower needs. While this is typical across the country, it's more evident in smaller towns such as Dodge because when Johnny goes marching off to war, everybody is sure to know about it.

This month the Dodge City draft board has summoned 28 young men for their physicals; March of last year it tapped only 6. Volunteer enlistments are up, too. In his second-floor office in the post office building, Navy Recruiter B. D. Legg relaxes to the beat of a radio blaring the Vietnam-inspired ballad, the "Ballad of the Green Berets."

"My business is great—just great," says the Navy man. "Vietnam is making my work easy. This month we're enlisting 13 boys from Dodge; we have 30 boys wanting to go for every 1 that we can take." Most, he concedes, are enlisting in the Navy to beat being drafted into the Army.

Across the way at the courthouse, Mrs. Ralph E. Oringderff, the area's Red Cross representative, has seen her workload pick up sharply. Part of her job is acting as liaison between servicemen and their families. But she also has a personal interest in how the war goes. Just the other day her younger brother left for the Army. And her 26-year-old husband, serving his first term as county clerk of Ford County, of which Dodge is part, is subject to the draft.

"I'm scared green they'll draft Ralph because he's so disgustingly healthy," Mrs. Oringderff says with a sigh. "It could just ruin us; I can't even watch pictures of fighting and wounded soldiers on television any-

more." Recently the couple bought a new \$20,000 house.

Mrs. Terry L. Hamilton, 19, already is experiencing the drastic changes the draft can bring. When her husband, a well-paid machinist, was drafted, she had to give up their apartment in Dodge and move back home with her family at Ensign, a hamlet west of here. "It really hurt us financially," Mrs. Hamilton reports. "I thought I was supposed to have a (dependent's allotment) check the first of February, but I just found out that I wouldn't be getting anything until Terry's out of boot camp."

To Eugene A. Conrardy, who farms 960 acres east of here, the drafting of his son Donnie poses what he considers a serious threat to the family's livelihood. Like many other small farmers in these parts, Mr. Conrardy has sought to supplement his income by working regularly at an off-the-farm job—in his case at a local metal shop.

"If the wheat comes on strong I'll be sunk," says Mr. Conrardy. "I won't have anybody to run my combine because Donnie did that. So it's either quit my job in town or hire someone to do the farmwork, and you just can't get dependable farm help."

Already, Mr. Conrardy says he has had to abandon his practice of leasing pastureland to graze cattle. "I was running 500 head a year," he says, "but when Donnie left, I had to let them all go. It's hopeless."

Even as they enjoy boom times, the handful of small factories along Dodge City's "manufacturer's row" on the southeast edge of town are becoming increasingly concerned about Vietnam.

HIGH COST OF TRAINING

A visitor finds R. H. Curtis, president of Curtis Machine Co., bending over a drafting table designing a new combination of gears for a gearbox the company produces. Five of the concern's 35-man work force have been drafted in the past year. "These days if applicants are eligible for the draft, we won't even bother to see them," Mr. Curtis says. "Our people cost too much money to train."

Mr. Curtis frets about rumors of priorities being placed on steel and machine tools. "If there are priorities," he says, "the guys with the Government contracts will get all the equipment." The shirt-sleeved executive also complains that a stretchout of deliveries is causing his company mounting problems. Steel bearings, castings and even grease seals are in short supply, he reports.

Down the street, Speed King Manufacturing Co., a maker of conveyor systems, ordered a new milling machine the other day and "We were told we wouldn't get it for 6 months," says R. Nathan Massey, chief engineer. "A few months ago we would have had it within a month."

Three of Speed King's 98 employees have gone into the military in the past year, "and we're having trouble replacing them with satisfactory help," according to Mr. Massey. If the draft is extended to include young married men with children, the plant would stand to lose its head machinist, shipping foreman, head draftsman, and two top salesmen. Adds Mr. Massey with a touch of sarcasm: "We lost a couple of workers to those so-called defense jobs," in which workers are often declared essential to the defense effort and thus avoid the draft.

Some employers are taking it upon themselves to try to help keyworkers avoid military service. Polkinghorn Feed Yards, Inc., a large cattle fattening operation on Dodge's east side, recently paid an attorney \$100 to draw up affidavits for prominent citizens to sign that would attest to Polkinghorn's hardship if one of its employees was drafted.

A "TOUGH" DRAFT BOARD

The local draft board—known as a tough one—turned down the appeal and the em-

ployee went off to Kansas City for his physical. But for Polkinghorn the story still had a happy ending; the employee flunked the medical exam and he's back at work inspecting cattle for disease.

Vietnam also is bringing some changes at the town's two colleges. At St. Mary of the Plains College, a 4-year institution, enrollment usually sags at the end of the first semester. This year, however, enrollment held steady at 619 students, mostly men. Sister M. Cecilia, St. Mary president, says, "Obviously, it's the threat of the draft that's keeping them in school."

The college did suspend five male students for disciplinary reasons, raising a local ruckus. Says Dean of Men Donald R. Barber: "We got more criticism over that than for anything we've ever done. Everybody said we were throwing those boys to the wolves—you know, the draft."

Students at St. Mary and at Dodge City Community Junior College, a 2-year school, are jittery about reports that some students will lose their draft deferments unless they make high grades. Recently a rumor swept through the junior college that the drafting of students was imminent. "One student hit the panic button and went down and volunteered," says Orville Kliever, the college's dean of admissions and registrar.

Vietnam accounts for 7 of every 10 letters written to the Washington office of Republican Congressman BOB DOLE, who represents the Dodge City area. A year ago, Mr. DOLE says, wheat allotments and tax matters made up most of the mail. Now, he says, the letter writers "want to know what's going on" in Vietnam and "when it's going to end." He adds: "They're about evenly divided between escalation and negotiation."

In addition, "more inquiries about farm deferments are coming in," he says. "Farmers and ranchers are writing that they don't think it's right to draft a man who's got a big investment in land and equipment—and then not take the college boy who has nothing invested and is hanging on in college by his teeth." For Mr. DOYLE's constituents, Senator WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT's recent televised hearings aimed at clearing the air on the Vietnam issue apparently haven't meant much, the Congressman says. "Many say they're more confused now than ever," he reports. "I'm even confused."

WHO'S FOOTING THE BILL ON THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 23, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] asked in a Senate colloquy just where the big money is coming from to push the Dirksen amendment. As Senators know, the high-priced and high-powered California public-relations firm of Whittaker & Baxter is being retained by undisclosed forces to promote the Dirksen amendment which would overrule the Supreme Court's defense of equality of citizenship in its reapportionment decisions.

The Milwaukee Journal has now joined in my colleagues' call for disclosure of the source of the funds being used in this massive effort to lobby the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal's editorial of March 14, entitled "Who's Footing this Bill?" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 25, 1966

replacing the present, multimember districts with single-member districts. Reapportionment based on a combination of single-member districts and on census population in place of registered voters (two of the major objectives being sought by the Burns administration) would introduce swift and radical changes in Hawaii's polity. Among other inevitable consequences would be the sudden and sizable increase in the political power of that portion of Oahu presently included in the fifth senatorial district. This area includes all of Oahu's sugar and pineapple plantations, as well as most of its military bases. As of 1964, the fifth senatorial district had only 84,000 registered voters within its population of approximately 300,000. By way of comparison, the fourth senatorial district, which includes most of Honolulu proper, the University of Hawaii, and the residences of a large part of the professional and civic leaders of the islands, had 80,000 registered voters within its population of approximately 180,000.⁴⁸ Those who are experienced in the realities of American State politics will recognize in the fifth district the characteristics—political apathy and low voting rates, among others—of constituencies in many other States that suffer from entrenched political machines and "bossism."

The ultimate question raised is whether representative government in Hawaii is not weakened regardless of the outcome of the judicially created reapportionment problem. Should this prove to be true, it would be all the more paradoxical, given the Supreme Court's avowed intention in these decisions. It is undeniable that Justice Warren and his majorities intended the reapportionment decisions as a rejuvenating tonic to strengthen debilitated legislatures. But the effect of forcing Warren's tonic down the gullet of Hawaii's Legislature has been to choke the patient, leaving a formerly healthy legislative body in need of further medication. It is clear that the judicial doctors who compounded Warren's tonic failed to understand important aspects of government in general and representative government in particular. A better understanding of the spirit of representative government would have impelled the Court to reconsider the soundness of prescribing sweeping, uniform remedies in the reapportionment cases. Here, in the name of "majoritarianism," the Supreme Court overthrew a vast array of varied representative institutions, most of which had been sanctioned by democratic electorates in referendum elections.

More broadly, the Court failed to remember the political teaching which had preserved its own independence a quarter-century earlier, when F.D.R.'s liberal objectives impelled him toward reckless action. The Senate committee which preserved the Court knew that all government must rule through a judicious mixture of force and persuasion. The attachment of the American people to its long-established institutions has gradually contributed to the creation of a law-abiding spirit, thereby reducing the coercive element of rule. One might have thought, and could certainly have wished, that the Court had dealt with reapportionment in a manner designed to minimize changes in the institutional structure and workings of State legislatures. But the Court allowed itself to lose sight of this truth of conservatism through its zeal for liberal legislation. In this respect it would have done well to remember the words of a Senator who led the fight to protect the Court. Said Burton K. Wheeler, "A liberal cause was never won by stacking a deck of cards, by stuffing a ballot box, or packing a Court." Nor, in the case of Hawaii, by reapportioning a legislature.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, every day our newspapers and radio and television bring us a graphic story of the gallant fighting of the South Vietnamese, the American forces, and our allies in that war-torn country. But there is another battle being waged out there about which the American people are not so well informed.

It is the struggle for the loyalty and commitment of the Vietnamese people; and in the final analysis its outcome will be just as important as the military effort. For this other conflict also arrays the forces of freedom against those of oppression, terror, and coercion.

In this struggle, the psychological factor is of cardinal importance; and the American Government is using every means at its disposal to advise and assist the Government of Vietnam in waging an intensive and effective campaign in that field.

The President has delegated the overall responsibility for coordinating and directing U.S. psychological and informational activities in Vietnam to Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency. A U.S. field organization—the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, under the direction of Embassy Minister-Counselor Barry Zorthian—has been established to carry out this responsibility within Vietnam.

This organization, which combines the talents and resources of the U.S. Information Agency, the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense represents a unique development in integrated U.S. Government activities abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Wall Street Journal describing some of these operations be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR—U.S. AIR-DROPS RADIOS, SAFE-CONDUCT PASSES TO WIN OVER VIETCONG—"DADDY PLEASE COME HOME" LEAFLETS, OTHER PLEAS HELP LIFT FOE'S DEFECTION RATE—2,500 TV SETS LURE CROWDS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Psychological warfare experts here recently hit on what seemed a promising ploy. They proposed to drop 1-pound bags of rice on tiny parachutes to the rice-hungry cities of North Vietnam. Attached to each bag would be a message of brotherhood from the South Vietnamese.

The proponents foresaw these gains:

The northerners might conclude that South Vietnam was a lot better fed and so might sour on their own government in Hanoi.

The recipients would realize the food-dropping planes could instead have delivered bombs; mixed feelings of gratitude and apprehension about air attack might be aroused.

If Communist authorities rushed up to wrest the free food from people in the streets, public discontent would rise.

But psychological warriors in Saigon warned that the Communists might secretly inject poison into some of the rice bags and then charge the United States with waging "poison warfare." Recalling the Commu-

nists' loud "germ warfare" cries during the Korean war, they insisted this prospect was real.

IMAGINATIVE THINKING

So the plan, rather than the rice, was dropped. But the incident provided an insight into the kind of imaginative thinking that is going into an increasingly active effort to influence the minds of soldiers and civilians in North Vietnam and enemy-controlled areas of the south.

"Psychological operations in one form or another are as old as war itself," says one Pentagon practitioner, a combat veteran. "In World War II we took the attitude: 'To hell with psycops; if we kill enough of the enemy and capture enough territory, victory will take care of itself.' But you can't win with that philosophy in Vietnam. Now, the objective is not just to kill and capture, but to win over the people."

In this war for men's minds, the United States and its South Vietnamese allies are loosing such weapons as propaganda broadcasts, air-dropped propaganda leaflets, safe-conduct passes for Communist soldiers desiring to defect and much more. The aim is not only to spur desertions from Red ranks but to encourage surrender of arms, to impede Communist recruiting of guerrilla fighters and to discourage local supply of food and information to the enemy. Some solid, if small, successes are being reported.

In all, this campaign now employs the talents of several hundred United States and South Vietnamese specialists, military and civilian. Since April last year, when propaganda broadcasts to North Vietnam began, to be supplemented by air-dropped messages, over 113 million leaflets have cascaded upon nearly every city, town and hamlet in Ho Chi Minh's domain. During the same period, more than 133 million leaflets have been directed at areas of South Vietnam controlled or threatened by Vietcong guerrillas.

THEMES THAT GET STRESS

According to Leonard Marks, director of the U.S. Information Agency, which coordinates American psychological operations in Vietnam, the leaflets and broadcasts stress a few simple themes: The destructive war in South Vietnam continues because of Communist aggression directed by North Vietnam and egged on by the Red Chinese; the Saigon government is trying its best to bring peace and progress to its citizens; the combined military might of the Allied forces is so great the Communists can't prevail; defectors from Red ranks will be well-treated; the U.S. bombing in the north is simply aimed at bringing the war to an end.

The exact effect of this verbal offensive is naturally difficult to ascertain; Mr. Marks and associates do at least point to virulent counterattacks by Radio Hanoi and North Vietnamese newspapers as evidence that "It's getting under their skin."

But as one military man puts it, actual results, especially among hostile troops, depend more on the tide of war than the brilliance of the propaganda. If the enemy thinks he's winning, he'll put up with danger, fatigue and short rations; but if he feels he's losing he's much more prone to look for a way out and listen seriously to offers of safety and food. And with the war's fortunes lately seeming to turn against the Communist side, the psychological warriors have some specific gains to point to.

Recently they keyed a special campaign to the Buddhist New Year in late January; some leaflets aimed at guerrillas operating away from home portrayed little girls appealing "Daddy, won't you please come home?" Other leaflets attacked Vietcong taxation, forced labor and killing of innocent peasants. Before this campaign, daily defections from enemy ranks averaged about 40; during January and February the rate

March 25, 1966

civilian communities."⁴⁰ The Governor's grounds for rejecting Hawaii's traditional practice was developed at length in his appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. He argues there that a change is needed "because the use of the 'registered voters' test tends to discriminate against persons in the lower economic levels, and under the circumstances prevailing in Hawaii, introduces other inequities into legislative apportionment."⁴¹ As might be expected:

"The proportion of registered persons in Hawaii—and very likely in other States—in the lower economic brackets is substantially less than those in the higher * * * of persons with a family income of less than \$4,000, only 43.8 percent of those eligible were registered, while those in the \$10,000 to \$14,999 bracket, 72.4 percent were registered. It is apparent therefrom that the use of registered voters unduly favors those on the higher economic levels and discriminates against those on the lower. The right to be fairly and effectively represented is a fundamental one and should not be made to depend upon an assiduousness in the pursuit of other rights, such as the right to vote."⁴²

The Governor is quite right in his assertion that use of the registered-voters criterion discriminates (but not, as he says) "against" that part of the community which, for whatever reason, is not assiduous in its exercise of the franchise. It also discriminates between citizens and aliens; between adults and children ineligible to vote; between those in possession of their mental faculties and those confined to mental institutions; between law-abiding citizens and inmates of prisons; and, most importantly, between those duly qualified citizens who exercise the franchise and those apathetic, irresponsible, or uninterested people who don't care enough about their right to vote to bother to register. The "registered voters" test, in short, discriminates between that part of the community which has the legal right and personal motivation to exercise the suffrage and that part of the community which cannot or does not vote. The islands' statesmen have long made sound use of this politically reasonable distinction, and some consideration of Hawaii's experience in this respect may assist us in considering the necessity or desirability of judicial determination of political questions of this sort.

As is generally known, the islands have been dependent on plantation agriculture as the mainstay of their economy for the past century. The plantations placed primary reliance on an alien work force from roughly the end of the American Civil War to the end of World War II. Laborers were recruited chiefly in China, Japan, and the Philippines. They came to Hawaii voluntarily, generally in the expectation of working for a period of some 5 to 10 years, and then returning with savings sufficient to purchase farms in their native lands. The bulk of these laborers did so, although a small proportion remained in the islands.

Very few of these laborers became citizens of the Hawaiian monarchy or the Republic. After Hawaii's annexation to the United States, the Chinese and Japanese there were not eligible for citizenship under American law.⁴³ They were protected by the law, and

were in fact represented by the consuls of their native governments, each of which maintained consular offices in Honolulu. As aliens, however, they were not permitted to register as voters and were therefore not included in apportionment calculations. As inhabitants of a country in which they were residing for a limited, special purpose, and presumably only temporarily, they were not obliged to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. They were not called upon to fight in the Armed Forces, to serve on juries, to devote time to running for office at any level, or to contribute generally to the community as citizens.

In basing apportionment on registered voters, Hawaii's constitution-makers took the not unreasonable view that people who, because of disabilities, legal or whatever, are unable to participate actively as citizens in at least a minimal fashion, should not be permitted to affect decisively the mode of representation. In Hawaii today, in fact, one of the most immediate and significant effects of a shift from registered voters to census population as the basis of apportionment would be to open up vast possibilities for political exploitation, especially in those areas where there are large numbers of politically apathetic aliens or military personnel. While the precise results are impossible to predict, there are inherent possibilities for political aggrandizement which might well be envied by political bosses anywhere. At the minimum, it is indisputable that the proposed change from registered voters to census population would afford significant additional political advantage to Hawaii's already dominant party, while likely lowering the quality of Hawaii's political life.

This is not to argue that the community has not, does not, or should not take account of the basic needs of people not counted in the apportionment scheme because they are not registered voters. In fact most observers of Hawaii would agree that the needs of its alien population have been met reasonably well, as is partly suggested by the very substantial role played by their descendants in the political life of the State today.

Any such arrangements have their dangers to the individuals concerned; these are obvious enough, especially to a court, which is quite properly concerned to protect individual rights. But against these dangers, as we have tried to suggest, must be balanced other weighty considerations bearing on the character of the whole polity. Inevitably, statesmen are confronted with the problem of representation. Their determinations at any given time must be based on an intimate knowledge of the complexities of their respective polities. These determinations are not always just or wise, but the question posed by Reynolds is whether any all-embracing, nationwide judicial doctrine is likely to be better. It is at least questionable—and on the basis of the Reynolds opinion perhaps more than questionable—whether the courts are likely to see these considerations clearly and to weigh them well, especially considering the great variety of such questions throughout the 50 States.

A comparable and related question, central to reapportionment in Hawaii, is whether the courts will permit the islands to continue to make use of multimember representative districts, or whether the State will have to be carved into single-member districts exclusively. Testimony on the political usefulness of Hawaii's long-established practice in this area was provided by one of the chief witnesses during the 1964 Senate hearings on reapportionment: "Ever since we have voted in Hawaii—and this started over 120

citizens of the United States and citizens of the territory of Hawaii." Ch. I, sec. 4. A small number of Chinese were so qualified, but almost no Japanese plantation laborers had become citizens of the Republic.

years ago—we have had multimember districts for our legislature. Multimember districts, when tied with Hawaii's long-known habit of plunking (voting for only one candidate, when multiple votes are possible) permits a minority to secure representation."⁴⁴ Partly for this reason, a Democratic minority was able to maintain its existence during the extended period when the Republican Party was dominant in the islands. In recent years, the preservation of a Republican minority has been fostered during a period of Democratic ascendancy through multimember districts.⁴⁵

The understandable temptation on the part of a dominant political party to redistrict the minority party out of existence has been thwarted in Hawaii by the fact that district boundaries have been firmly fixed both by nature and tradition. As the district court noted, "The records of the constitutional convention (proceedings 103-111) show the districting, both for the senate and the house of representatives, followed along historical, political, geographic, and physical lines."⁴⁶ Thus, the senate districts under Hawaii's present constitution consist of separate islands, with two exceptions, while the sixth representative district consists of the islands of Molokai and Lanai, the seventh district of the islands of Maui and Kahoolawe (five representatives), and the eighth district that portion of the island of Oahu known as Koolaupoko and Koolauloa (two representatives). As the witness before the Senate, previously quoted, stressed:

"What are the metes and bounds of these districts? They are known only by history, and historical boundaries go far to explain our present apportionment. Roughly, our present political districting conforms with our island groupings, and as units in political structuring they go far back to the beginning of representative government in Hawaii. Anyone who would chip off a part of Oahu and link it with Kauai or the island group which has had Maui as its center bears the burden of proof of demonstrating that our major political divisions have no salience for today's world."⁴⁷

Evidence that Hawaii's traditional system of multimember districts continues to be salient for the needs of the contemporary community is afforded by the fact that virtually no one had been seeking changes in the district lines until the Court's action in Reynolds. The district court's rejection of the legislature's reapportionment plans indicates that the Federal judiciary will not permit Hawaii to retain its well-established representative districts. Should the delegates to a constitutional convention be no more successful than the legislature in proposing a redistricting plan acceptable to courts, then, presumably, the judges will undertake this delicate task themselves. If redistricting is carried out by the district court, it is probable that the judges could most easily avoid the danger of creating what they termed "monolithic political units" by

⁴⁴ Norman Meller, statement delivered to the Second State Legislature of Hawaii, first special session of 1964, July 20, 1964, p. 2. For further discussions of the relationship of different voting systems and representation of minorities see George S. Blair, "Cumulative Voting: An Effective Electoral Device in Illinois Politics" (Urbana, Ill.: The University of Illinois Press, 1960). Also helpful is Maurice Duverger, "Political Parties."

⁴⁵ At present the Republicans hold two of five senate seats in the fourth senatorial district although the Democrats are in the majority. Similarly, in the heavily Republican 15th representative district the Democrats have consistently held two of the six seats.

⁴⁶ Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii dated Feb. 17, 1965, reported at 238 F. Supp. 468.

⁴⁷ Meller statement, p. 2.

⁴⁰ Gov. John A. Burns, address to the joint session of the second State Legislature of Hawaii, first special session of 1964, July 23, 1964, p. 11.

⁴¹ John A. Burns, Governor of the State of Hawaii, *Appellant v. William S. Richardson, et al.*, *Appellees*, Appeal from the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1965, p. 18.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴³ Hawaii's Organic Act, as written by the 56th Cong. in 1900, provided "That all persons who were citizens of the Republic of Hawaii on Aug. 12, 1898, are hereby declared to be

more than doubled. Among the defectors was a 22-man guerrilla platoon, the largest single unit to come over during the war, along with growing numbers of enemy officers, including the commander of a North Vietnamese army battalion.

A FRIENDLY PHOTO

Properly exploited, key defections often start a chain reaction, the professionals say. To insure that a defector won't change his mind and go back to his unit, his picture is taken with the arm of a South Vietnamese or American officer around his shoulder. He's told that copies of this photo will be dropped among his former comrades "to let them know of his right decision."

Any defector is first fed, clothed, interrogated, given medical attention and some political indoctrination. Then he is urged to make statements explaining to his former friends why he switched sides and how he has been treated. Some statements are printed on leaflets for airdrop, others are taperecorded and broadcast from airborne loudspeakers over his guerrilla stomping grounds.

In one recent operation in Bey Tuy Province, a 40-year-old Vietcong platoon leader, a guerrilla for 15 years, was captured. After friendly treatment he agreed to record a surrender appeal; he even flew with a psychological operations officer in a helicopter and pointed out hiding places of his unit so the tape could be played. This effort, it's said, helped induce several Vietcong to surrender.

To undermine the countryside's confidence in the Vietcong, the "psywarriors" are turning knowledge of Vietnam's folkways to their advantage—in what's called Operation Rigor Mortis.

It seems there's a strong feeling among Vietnamese that when they die they want to be buried in their own villages, near their ancestors. In recruiting guerrillas, the Communists promise not only that the men will fight in their own localities, but if killed, will be handed over to their relatives for proper burial. This is why, in the war's early stages, few enemy dead were found on the battlefield; the guerrillas would haul them away to fulfill this promise.

DISCOURAGES RECRUITING

But in some of the recent large-scale battles, it has been impossible to remove the bodies. So psychological warfare people make an effort after battles to get the names of the remaining dead (from papers found on the bodies) and quickly broadcast to their home areas the news that loved ones have been abandoned to die, far away from home. It's admittedly a somewhat grisly business, but it's considered very effective in discouraging guerrilla recruiting by the Vietcong and in lowering morale among their units.

Within South Vietnam, much of the psychological warfare effort concentrates on spreading good news, beamed as much at the ears and eyes of the general populace as at the enemy. Word goes forth telling of the Saigon government's building of roads and bridges and hospitals, protection of rice harvests being moved to market, victories in battle. Such information is disseminated by radio, provincial newspapers, hamlet bulletin boards, roving government information teams and drama groups that weave their message into entertainment programs.

Early last month, the Saigon regime started using television to help get the word out. U.S. funds, through the Agency for International Development, were used to purchase 2,500 23-inch table model TV sets from Radio Corp. of America for distribution to public reading rooms, community centers and schools in areas within 40 miles of Saigon. From 8 to 9 p.m., daily, the Saigon government broadcasts news and information, beaming the signals through equipment

abroad a pair of U.S. Navy-operated C-121 aircraft hovering overhead; a TV tower is to be built eventually.

TV is such a novelty in Vietnam that throngs are said to gather around the community sets each evening to watch the Vietnamese language broadcast over channel 11. Since the U.S. Army telecasts American TV shows over channel 9 and doesn't want to lure viewers from the Government program, it blanks out for that hour. "We don't want to put Premier Ky up against 'Gunsmoke,'" comments a U.S. officer.

AN AUDIO THORN

Far more information is put out by radio: The Voice of America alone broadcasts music, news and other programs 6½ hours a day in Vietnamese from a powerful transmitter at Hue, on the northern coast of South Vietnam. The message goes both to North and South Vietnam, and has evoked an explosive reaction from the north. "This installation must be an audio thorn in the side of the Communists, since they have shelled it several times over the past year and a half and our personnel there have found it prudent to carry out their duties wearing sidearms," reports Mr. Marks.

To make sure the other side hears these messages, the United States has dropped more than 10,000 cheap little transistor radios into enemy stations. "We don't want them to use our gifts to tune in Radio Hanoi." Not surprisingly, North Vietnamese authorities have urged their people to turn in any of these "Yankee radios"; they even claim the sets are booby-trapped and can be exploded by a special radio signal.

Many leaflets dropped on populous areas in the north are intended to avert needless loss of civilian lives there, and perhaps to spare the United States from blame for such loss. These messages simply urge civilians to move away from installations likely to be bombed. One leaflet resembles a green and white North Vietnamese 50-plaster note on one side; on the other it says, among other things: "For your safety, stay away from military installations and communications facilities."

A specially planned sequence of leaflets is aimed at North Vietnamese Army men on the way to infiltrate the south. In their northernmost training camps, they receive leaflets saying: "We know you are destined to come to South Vietnam to fight." Further south along the infiltration route, they are told: "If you do come across, we'd like you to join us in our struggle against the Communists." Just before they cross the border, they are messaged: "Here is a safe-conduct pass; it will pass you safely through our lines and save your life." Toward the end of their southward trip, perhaps along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in eastern Laos, they get not only safe-conduct passes but also specific money offers for arms they may bring with them.

Typical inducements: 6,300 plasters (\$87 at the official exchange rate) for a heavy machinegun, 2,000 plasters for a submachinegun, 1,000 plasters for a carbine, 800 plasters for a pistol. (Because it may be dangerous for the northerners to try to defect with their arms, they're told they can hide a weapon and still get the specified reward when it's picked up by South Vietnamese forces who have been tipped off on the hiding place.)

A NEW ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New Mexico State Legislature adopted House Joint Memorial 14, urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New

Mexico. This is a facility of great importance to the betterment of Indian youngsters, and I have urged approval of funds to plan the construction of the new school. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 14

Joint memorial urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico

Whereas an emergency presently exists in New Mexico to provide adequate facilities for a basic education and post-high school vocational training to an ever-increasing number of Indians; and

Whereas the present Federal Government Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico has unsafe and unsuitable facilities for a modern educational program, and does not provide a much needed post-high school vocational training program; and

Whereas the public schools in New Mexico are unable and will be unable to provide the education and training to Indians in time to meet this urgent need; and

Whereas if the Indians are to strike a telling blow against unemployment and poverty among themselves, expanded facilities for the education and training of Indians is required; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government build a new Albuquerque Indian School to provide a basic education and post-high school vocational training program for Indians so that they may compete on an equal basis with others in this modern world; and

Whereas the new Albuquerque Indian School could provide boarding facilities so that there could be a necessary transition for more and more Indians from reservation life to city life;

Whereas the new Albuquerque Indian School is endorsed by all major Indian Tribes and pueblos in New Mexico including the Navajo Tribe, the All-Indian Pueblo Council, the Mescalero Apache Tribe and the Jicarilla Apache Tribe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and to the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

BRUCE KING,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

MACK EASLEY,

President, New Mexico Senate.

A DEDICATED HEART—A YOUNG WIDOW WRITES ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently a longtime friend, who is serving in southeast Asia, sent me a copy of the Observer, a weekly publication of U.S. Forces in Vietnam. Like many newspapers these days, the Observer carried a letter to the editor in regard to the war in Vietnam. But this letter was most unusual in its message and eloquence.

It matches in poignancy anything I have read concerning the need for young men to take up arms in defense of a country or a cause.

I ask that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD together with a brief editor's note which explains, in part, why the newspaper chose to print it and why I choose to have it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge all my colleagues, particularly those who cannot find it in their hearts to support the struggle for freedom in Vietnam, to read this letter from a young bride who said goodbye to her husband 17 days after their marriage and learned less than a month and a half later that he had died in battle.

There being no objection, the letter and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEDICATED HEART

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Hundreds of letters in support of the war in Vietnam come across the desk of the Observer each week, representing all degrees of articulateness and viewpoint.

(However, we have never received a letter with the eloquence, the emotional impact, of this letter from a 17-year-old widow whose 19-year-old husband was killed in action in Vietnam.

(Her courage is in the finest tradition of this land that has become the United States of America, and her unusually mature recognition of her husband's desire to defend his country, his way of life and his posterity, prompts us to print the letter in its entirety.

(There is a lesson to be learned from the courage, understanding and patriotism of this young American. The letter was addressed to Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, COMUSMACV.)

DEAR GENERAL WESTMORELAND: I received your letter today and I was surprised but pleased to get it and I felt that I should write and tell you this.

Tom and I were married only 17 days when he was shipped overseas or rather to California. He left there on December 28. We were married 1 month and 24 days when he died. I loved Tommy and I know that he died for a purpose. He told me over and over again to try and understand why he had to go. I learned that Tom could have been deferred because he was the only one left to carry on the Devlin name, now there is no one when his father dies. He said that he didn't want to be deferred, it was his job and he had to do it. I understand and I loved him for it. Tom was a brave man and I'm proud of him. He said that he had rather fight the Communists in Vietnam and die if he had to, than to let them come over here and he said that if we don't stop them now, it won't be too long until we'll be fighting them at home.

Tommy was only 19 years old. I'm 17. We were young to get married, but it was what we wanted and my parents agreed. We both knew that he might never come back alive, but we had such faith and hope that he would. I know that God had a reason for taking Tom and I must accept this. Tom and I went to see the chaplain on the day before he left. He told Chaplain Crick, "I'm not afraid; God will deliver me—one way or another." Since Tom's death the people in our community have realized that the war in Vietnam isn't so far away any more. Tommy was the first boy in Hopkins County to be killed in this war.

I feel the same way Tom and all the guys over there feel toward the draft-card burners and protesters. Tom and hundreds of guys like him are fighting and dying every day for them, for all of us here in America so that we can live in a free world. Why can't these people realize this? I know that my husband didn't die in vain, he died for what he believed in and I'm proud that he stood firm on this. He was proud to be a

paratrooper and to be able to do something for his country. Maybe that's one of the reasons I loved him so much, he was a paratrooper—all the way.

I hope you don't mind my writing you this letter, but it was just something I felt I had to do and I wanted to do it. May God watch over and protect you and all the men there fighting for America. I pray for all of you, my prayers can't help my Tommy any more, he's at peace now and he's with God, but maybe they'll help somebody.

I've enclosed an editorial that appeared in our local newspaper 2 days after we learned of Tom's death. May God protect all of you and give us strength and faith to accept his will.

Sincerely,

VELMA DEVLIN.

BAD TIMING DOOMS CUTS IN SCHOOL AID

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Congress is showing more concern each day about administration proposals to reduce substantially four exceptionally successful education programs in fiscal 1967.

The programs are financial assistance for impacted areas, funds for the National Defense Education Act, support for land-grant colleges, and the school lunch and milk programs. The proposed reductions would cut about a half billion dollars in appropriations from fiscal 1966 from these vital programs.

Plans for increased educational services in Nevada, which continues to increase in population at a phenomenal rate, would be seriously curtailed if the Congress were to go along with the proposed reductions. Funds for education in all the States would likewise be curtailed, and the areas effected by the cuts would not benefit by proposals to increase educational spending for other programs.

It has been gratifying to see so many Members of both Houses of Congress speak out against the proposed reductions, and I am confident that these unsound cuts will be rejected.

Mr. President, an excellent editorial on reaction to education reductions appeared in the March 21 edition of the Las Vegas Sun, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAD TIMING DOOMS CUTS IN SCHOOL AID

President Johnson's proposals to reduce Federal grants for education means a lot of money to us as it does the rest of the States, with the impact of the cuts emphasized, because they would come at a time when distress signals are being sent aloft by Nevada educators.

In two major areas, Federal payments to land-grant colleges and in Federal aid to impacted school districts, nearly \$3 million is at stake in Nevada.

Mr. Johnson called for cutbacks of \$482.7 million in appropriations and \$291.9 million in spending in the programs. The cutbacks from the current fiscal year funds would affect every State and congressional district in the Nation.

Cuts were asked in aid to federally impacted school districts, assistance for land-grant colleges, direct Government loans for college students, and programs which supply hot lunches and milk to schoolchildren.

The presidential ax chopped deeply into

aid for schools which serve children whose parents live or work on Federal property. Reductions amounted to \$163.6 million for school operating costs and \$27.1 million for construction.

The Government paid Nevada school districts more than \$2.7 million last year to help pay the costs of educating children whose parents live or work on Federal installations. Federal grants to the University of Nevada under the Land Grant College Act exceed \$200,000 a year.

If the President's proposal is accepted, Nevada school districts will receive only \$949,759 to help pay the costs of educating the children of Federal workers, servicemen, and others who live or work on Federal installations. The President requested no appropriation for land-grant colleges in fiscal 1967.

He also proposed cuts in school hot lunch and milk program appropriations and a reduction in funds for Federal loans to students.

But there is a serious question whether Congress will accede to the President's proposals.

Members of Congress as liberal as Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and as conservative as Senator JOHN C. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, opposed the cuts. Opponents included key members of Education Committees in both Chambers.

Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, said, "I don't think there is a chance of passing any kind of retrenchment in school aid. The President is not running for reelection. We are."

MORSE, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's education subcommittee, said, "Open the window and let the Great Society fly out. That is exactly what the President is trying to do."

Cutbacks in other education programs amounted to \$179 million in National Defense Education Act (NDEA) funds and \$101 million in school food programs.

The proposed cuts would be made in programs which have long, popular histories in Congress. Aid to land grant colleges started in 1862 with the Morrill Act. School food programs started in 1936, aid to impacted areas in 1940, and direct loans to college students in 1958.

Former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy tried to cut back the impacted areas programs, but were rebuffed by Congress.

President Johnson, despite intensive opposition, is attempting to focus the school food programs on needy children. He proposed the Child Nutrition Act in 1966 to provide free hot lunches and school breakfasts for the needy. He asked for \$50 million to finance the program.

The vocal opposition in Congress gives the administration scant hope of cutting back on any education program in this election year.

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DAV

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on February 16, I had the honor of introducing to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs the national commander of the DAV, Mr. Claude Callegary, of Baltimore, Md. Mr. Callegary delivered before the committee a comprehensive statement of the DAV legislative objectives for the year 1966.

For many years, Mr. Callegary has been a close personal friend of mine. It was my pleasure to place his name in nomination for his present post at the DAV national convention in New Orleans last August.

March 25, 1966

6472

UNIFORM DATES FOR DAYLIGHT
SAVING TIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1404, the Uniform Time Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMON ABUSES IN CONSUMER
CREDIT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I may proceed for not more than 15 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the rule is waived, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on consumer interests, the President reiterated his recommendation that Congress enact a truth-in-lending law. Such legislation has been with us for several sessions, and lengthy hearings have been held.

I have supported the effort of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] over the years to have such legislation enacted. I believe that I am a cosponsor of all such bills that have been introduced by him.

Most of us are already aware, at least in a general way, of the purpose of this legislation. But I think it will be well worth recalling the abuses that led to it.

A bewildering variety of methods of stating consumer finance charges confronts the typical borrower or buyer today. Often he is unable to understand or compare the financing terms offered by sellers or lenders.

Theodore Yntema, vice president of the Ford Motor Co., said at a Senate hearing on automobile financing a few years ago:

The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

The borrower or buyer is at a double disadvantage: he is unaware of the true costs of credit use, and he is unable to shop around and compare alternative finance charges offered by different lenders and sellers. This is because there are so many different ways of stating the cost of credit use.

Let me list for you four of the most common practices:

First. No rate quoted: The buyer or borrower is told only that the charges will be so much down and so much per week or per month.

Second. Add-on or discount rate: The borrower is given a rate on the original amount of the credit rather than on the periodic declining balance. The annual percentage rate is approximately twice as high as the so-called add-on or discount rate.

Third. Add-on discount rate plus fees: Numerous extra fees may be charged in addition to the add-on or discount rate. This serves to raise the annual percentage rate to considerably more than twice the quoted rate.

Fourth. Simple monthly rate: The finance charge is disclosed to the borrower in terms of an all-inclusive simple monthly rate. The annual percentage rate is 12 times the monthly rate.

The consumer can only be confused or deceived by this variety of ways to state the charges for credit use. It is impossible for anyone who is not an expert in the practices of the consumer credit fields to compare costs expressed in these many ways.

In fact, even Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, when he was testifying at hearings on this legislation, said that he was confused by some of the practices in use to state—or misstate—the cost of consumer credit.

We cannot expect the average wage-earner or housewife to understand something that is confusing to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the confusion. Credit is a valuable asset. Consumers are well advised to use their credit wisely and guard it carefully. But they cannot do a good job of either unless they know how much their credit use is costing them.

This legislation, which is recommended by the President, would require that lenders and vendors disclose their finance charges in a standard, clear, and meaningful way—both in dollars and as an annual percentage rate.

It is time we acted to guarantee the American consumer this vital information. It is the essential clue which will enable him to find his way through the confusing and misleading labyrinth that is the consumer credit marketplace today.

Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for his support of the consumers' interest in this message. I hope the result will be legislation by Congress along the lines of the bill for which the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so long fought. I am delighted that the President of the United States is now urging on us to act to correct these evils.

INTENSIFIED BOMBING IN NORTH
VIETNAM NOT DESIRABLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill for Vietnam earlier this week several distinguished Senators took issue with the view of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that further intensification of bombing in North Vietnam was not desirable.

Both the Secretary and General Wheeler spelled out in the course of the hearings, in what was to me a completely logical way, their reasons for concluding that it was not wise under the present circumstances either to start bombing the cities of North Vietnam, or to attempt to destroy the oil installation and storage facilities there, or to bomb or mine Haiphong Harbor.

Nevertheless, these Senators, as was their right, undertook to disagree with General Wheeler and Secretary McNamara. Now I note that the cause of the generals who favor intensified bombings has been taken up by their usual protagonist, that arch hawk columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

On the other hand, the position taken by the Senators in question has been criticized by Mr. James Reston, and was this morning commented on again in a column by Mr. Marquis Childs.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column entitled "Politics of War," and Mr. Reston's column entitled "Washington: How To Make Things Worse Than They Are," and Mr. Childs' column entitled "A Rising Pressure To Bomb Cities," may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS OF WAR
(By Joseph Alsop)

Like the usual cloud no bigger than a man's hand, the politics of the war in Vietnam are already beginning to appear above the horizon.

On the one hand, President Johnson has taken to representing himself as a stalwart rampart of "restraint," almost alone in holding off the dangerous designs of the military. This has become a standard turn, complete with Billy Graham organ tones in the vox humana range, at large rallies like the recent Governors' meeting at the White House.

The designs cited tend to be pretty hair-raising. One of them, reportedly, was to bomb the Chinese nuclear powerplants. No one, of course, has even remotely suggested doing anything of that sort, unless the Chinese get into the Vietnamese war with both feet. Hence the news of these quasi-public Johnsonian image-polishings have not exactly promoted good feelings in the Pentagon.

nated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee to inspect appropriate books, papers, records, and documents.

(d) All information reported to or otherwise obtained by the Secretary or his representative pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), which information contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

PROHIBITED ACTS

Sec. 13. (a) No person shall—

(1) manufacture for sale, sell, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States for resale, any tire manufactured or retreaded or any motor vehicle assembled on or after the date any applicable standards take effect under this Act unless it is in conformity with such standards as prescribed or amended by the Secretary pursuant to section 4, 5, 6, or 8 of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section; or

(2) fail or refuse to permit entry or inspection as authorized under section 12(b) of this Act or fail or refuse access to or copying of records, or fail to make reports or provide information, as required under section 12(c).

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to the sale, the offer for sale, or the introduction or delivery for introduction in interstate commerce of any tire or motor vehicle after the first purchase of it in good faith where the tire is labeled as conforming to Federal minimum safe performance standards.

(c) (1) A tire or motor vehicle offered for importation in violation of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be refused admission into the United States, but the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary may, by joint regulations, provide for authorizing the importation of a tire or motor vehicle, or class thereof, into the United States upon such terms and conditions (including the furnishing of a bond) as may appear to them appropriate to insure that any such tire or motor vehicle will be brought into conformity with any applicable standards prescribed under this Act, or will be exported or abandoned to the Government.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary may, by joint regulations, prohibit the importation of any tire or motor vehicle, or class thereof, into the United States, unless it meets any standards or regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to a tire intended solely for export, if it is labeled on the outside of the shipping container to show that it is intended for export and is so exported.

(d) No person, firm, or corporation shall sell, offer for sale, or introduce for sale or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce any tire or motor vehicle equipped with any tire which has been regrooved, except that the Secretary may by order permit the sale of regrooved tires or motor vehicles equipped with such tires which he finds are designed and constructed in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act.

CIVIL PENALTY

Sec. 14. (a) Whoever violates any provision of section 13(a) (2) or 13(d), or any regulation issued thereunder, shall be subjected to a civil penalty of not to exceed \$1,000 for each such violation.

(b) Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. The amount of such penalty, when finally determined, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, may be deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the persons charged.

INJUNCTION; SUBPENAS

Sec. 15. (a) The United States district courts and the United States courts of the territories and of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this Act upon petition by the appropriate United States attorney or the Attorney General on behalf of the United States.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an order, injunction, or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedures applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(c) In all libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act, subpoenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

SEIZURE

Sec. 16. (a) Any motor vehicle tire that has been manufactured or introduced into commerce in violation of section 13 of this Act shall be liable to be proceeded against by the United States while in interstate commerce on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States and in any United States court for the territories, possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) Such tire shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings, under this section, involving the same claimant, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the case covered thereby.

(c) Any tire condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this section, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but such tire shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold: *Provided*, That, after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such tire shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act or

the laws of any State or territory in which sold, the court may by order direct that such tire be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this Act under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the tire under bond.

(d) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the tire, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the tire.

(e) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (c) of this section—

(1) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

(2) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

REGULATIONS, AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION

Sec. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized to issue and amend such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary, in exercising the authority under this Act, shall utilize the services, research, and testing facilities of public and competent private agencies to the maximum extent he determines practicable in order to avoid duplication in research, facilities, or operation services.

AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 18. To carry out the purpose of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,900,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$1,450,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, and \$1,600,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending measure, S. 2669, take place at 2 o'clock p.m., on Tuesday next and that for this purpose rule XII, clause 3, be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The vote will begin at 2 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.

(The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing is as follows:)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, March 29, 1966 at 2 o'clock p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of S. 2669, a bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of asking for a recess is so that Senators who wish to discuss the bill will have the time intervening between the prayer by the Chaplain and the hour designated for the vote in which to do so.

On the other hand, the military leaders are beginning to be manifestly restive, in the face of what someone has called the President's "image-warmaking." The restiveness is reflected in the recent demands for an air blockade of Haiphong Harbor by Senators RICHARD RUSSELL, STUART SYMINGTON, and others who are close to the military leadership.

In reality, blockading Haiphong is fairly low on the priority list of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But it must be noted that this low priority for Haiphong was authoritatively revealed in the course of the meeting which gave the strongest of all the recent hints of military restiveness. This was a background interview accorded to a group of correspondents by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler.

The reporters were told by Wheeler that they could say that the Joint Chiefs wished to intensify the northern bombing by attacking the vital oil-fuel stores of North Vietnam. They were also told that the Chiefs attached far less importance to Haiphong Harbor.

General Wheeler naturally did not speak for direct quotation; but as always happens in such cases, the highly significant identity of the spokesman for the Joint Chiefs is now an open secret. And the step that Wheeler took was truly remarkable by current standards; for there has been no room for the old-fashioned free expression of the American military in the new Pentagon of Robert S. McNamara.

What then, is all this churning really about? First of all, it is about the extremely detailed, indeed minute Presidential management of many aspects of the war. The precedent was set in the Cuban missile crisis. This was a psychological-political confrontation of hideous gravity, but a confrontation in which there was no fighting. It was ideally managed, too.

It is extremely questionable, however, whether the Cuban precedent should be followed, at any rate to anything like the present extent, in the quite different present case. No matter how many cables he reads, the President cannot sense the true effects of this hesitation, that delay, this other veto on an unseen and ugly war halfway around the world.

Yet the really major source of the present churning is something quite different. To find out its nature, it is only necessary to have a look at the Joint Chiefs' position on bombing the North Vietnamese oil-fuel depots, as formulated by General Wheeler.

To understand this position's real meaning, it is needful to bear in mind the long-range intelligence forecasts. These indicate a stepped-up North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, which is expected to continue until our troops are fighting the equivalent of 18-plus divisions of enemy regulars, in addition to guerrillas and Vietcong local forces.

These same forecasts indicated a stepped-up North Vietnamese treaty violation, to deliver close to 6,500 tons a month through Laos to South Vietnam. Without that tonnage, the divisions facing our troops will have no teeth—meaning ammunition. And this supply movement, calculated from port across North Vietnam, and down the Ho Chi Minh trail to the South Vietnamese border will require something like 10,000 trucks.

Naturally, then, the Joint Chiefs want to try to halt the trucks and cripple the supply movement by taking out the very vulnerable North Vietnamese oil-fuel stores. The Chiefs are going on the rule of doing what needs doing, which is always the necessary course in wartime.

If the intelligence forecasts prove correct, failing to do what so obviously needs doing will cost a shocking price, not only in Vietnam, but also here at home. President Johnson should remember his hero, Franklin

Roosevelt, who was not deterred from doing what needed doing by, for instance, threats of petulance in the Chicago Tribune.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1966]

WASHINGTON: HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY ARE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The pressure seems to be building up in the Senate for a policy of bombing, mining, or blockading the North Vietnamese harbor of Haiphong, and one reason for the pressure is obviously the forthcoming elections.

Not to close that harbor to the ships carrying war materiel to North Vietnam and the Vietcong, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, said today, "flies in the face of commonsense." He was supported by Senators STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, and HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

"It is going to be necessary to have a change in policy in some direction in the very near future, in my opinion," Senator RUSSELL added, "or this war will assume political proportions that will absolutely force it upon any man who has to go before the electorate of this country and seek public office." He thereupon proposed a blockade.

WAIT A MINUTE

Maybe we should look this one over a little before we jump. The thing can be done easily enough. Legally, it is a little misty since the United States is not formally at war with North Vietnam, but the lawyers will find a way through that thicket. An effective sea and air blockade of Haiphong, however, raises more practical questions.

First, if a Soviet ship carrying munitions to North Vietnam is intercepted by an American destroyer approaching Haiphong and refuses to turn around or be boarded, what do we do? Blow her out of the water? The consequences of that are likely to be rather awkward.

Second, a policy of mining the harbor, therefore, seems more likely to be more practical and less risky, though this too has to be considered in something other than domestic political terms.

No doubt it would have considerable effect on free world shipping now carrying supplies but not munitions to Haiphong. Insurance rates on ships heading that way would reach almost prohibitive heights as soon as the mining was announced. That would discourage those who are making a profit out of the war, and nobody would sob much about them.

THE SOVIET PROBLEM

The critical problem lies with the Soviet Government, now approaching a major ideological showdown with Communist China at the Communist Party Congress later this month. Peking's charge against Moscow is that it is soft on capitalism, timid in its approach to the Vietnamese war, and more interested in peaceful coexistence with the United States than in waging the Communist revolution.

In these circumstances, the Soviet Union is not so likely to turn back, as it did in the United States blockade of Cuba during the missile crisis of October 1962; but even if it decided not to risk blowing up its men and ships in Haiphong, there would still be a problem.

For diverting Soviet seaborne shipping to the air or the land would mean rerouting it over or through Communist China and thus placing the North Vietnamese Government even more in the grip of Communist China, which is precisely what the Johnson administration has always said it wanted to avoid.

This, to use Senator RUSSELL's phrase, really "flies in the face of common sense." One objective of our policy surely is not to

force Moscow and Peking closer together but to keep them apart; not to isolate Hanoi with the Communist Chinese but to give them some freedom of action to work with Moscow; not to increase Peking's leverage over North Vietnam but to limit it as much as possible.

The aim of closing the port is clear enough—to reduce our casualties—but to plunge into it worrying about senatorial casualties is another matter.

President Johnson, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of State Rusk and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, are all dubious that the advantages of closing Haiphong would be greater than the disadvantages, that it would really seriously hamper the flow of supplies to the enemy, and that it would do anything but bring about even more trouble in keeping the narrow channel of the Saigon River open for our own supplies. But Senator RUSSELL differs on both military and political grounds.

POLITICS AND POLICY

"I do not think we can afford to let this war drift on and on as it is now," he told the Senate yesterday. "Search and destroy tactics may, after 10 or 12 years, bring the Vietcong to their knees, but the American people are going to be very unhappy about it, and someone who comes along and says: 'I will go in and clean this thing up in 6 months,' will, I'm afraid, have some advantage over the Senators who say 'let's play this thing along for 10 or 12 years as we're going now.'"

Politicians who run for reelection, of course, have to worry about such things, but good politics is not necessarily good policy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 25, 1966]

A RISING PRESSURE TO BOMB CITIES

(By Marquis Childs)

The rumbling sound that comes from across the Potomac is the barely suppressed muttering of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. This low-keyed thunder out of the Military Establishment underscores the half-suppressed war within a war that is part of the tangled web of Vietnam.

Whether this portends a crisis in the direction of the war is what many observers are beginning to ask. The Joint Chiefs insist that they cannot win the war with the restraints imposed by policy set in the White House. They believe it is imperative to bomb installations in and around the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi and the port of Haiphong and at the same time, although there are differences on this score, to mine Haiphong harbor.

The JCS are acutely sensitive to the needling of Gen. Curtis LeMay and Gen. Thomas Power, both now retired from the Air Force where they were unremitting advocates of bombing everywhere.

So far these are subterranean noises. They have an echo in Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but that is a natural phenomenon that never fails. In short, the confrontation between the Commander in Chief and his chiefs is not a direct one.

The reason, of course, is the hard-pressed Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. He has come closer than any Secretary to imposing civilian control over the vast military apparatus, with spending set for the coming fiscal year at \$60 billion. He speaks to the President for the Pentagon.

But as a kind of dam—a filter is the word some Pentagon critics apply—McNamara finds it increasingly difficult to resist the big-bomber pressures from both his own establishment and from Capitol Hill. The fly boys and the aircraft manufacturers are a powerful combination. They exploit the popular mythology expressed in the conviction of the effectiveness of pinpoint bomb-

ing and a quick and comparatively painless victory through air power.

President Johnson, determined to hold the present status which he considers middle of the road, is in a bind. One thing most of his associates agree on is that the President finds the incessantly mounting demands of the war galling in the extreme. Sensitive to the play of public opinion, he is aware of deeply conflicting views—find a compromise way out on the one hand and get it over with quickly on the other. As spending on the war escalates into more billions the President's Great Society programs are faced with starvation.

At his elbow in the White House is Gen. Maxwell Taylor, whose title is special consultant to the President. Taylor is in agreement with the views of the Joint Chiefs. He put on the record before a Congressional committee his beliefs that mining the harbor of Haiphong would be a step in shutting off supplies to the Communists fighting the war in the south.

In the midst of this crossfire in Washington have come two developments in Vietnam—one deeply worrying, the other moderately hopeful. As to the first, the Honolulu honeymoon with Premier Nguyen Cao Ky is definitely cooled as a result of his handling of the firing of the flamboyant Lt. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander of the Vietnamese Army 1st Corps area. Instead of sending Thi out of the country, as was done when Gen. Nguyen Khanh was removed in 1964, he was allowed to go back to his stronghold. While this may prove to be no more than another jig by the dominant military, an upset in Saigon is still an ominous possibility.

The hopeful prospect was in a report from that straightforward soldier in command in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. Westmoreland pointed out that for a variety of reasons the direct impact on the enemy of American troops has never added up to more than 20,000 to 25,000. But he was confident that by late summer, when the overall total is as high as 275,000, up to two-thirds or more of that number will be directly engaged in fighting the Vietcong. Then, in Westmoreland's view, with 200,000 men fighting the enemy the Communists will know they can never drive the Americans out.

In the background of the Honolulu Conference was the private prediction that by mid-1967 the Vietcong would begin to fade out. That was the hopeful note communicated to the President. It seemed to imply a holding position in the middle ground that he is convinced, in spite of critics on both sides, he occupies. But, as so often before, events in Vietnam have a way of catching up with the best laid plans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with Secretary McNamara, General Wheeler, Mr. James Reston, and Mr. Marquis Childs. The proposals that we intensify the bombing of North Vietnamese installations, that we destroy oil supplies by bombing, that we mine or bomb Haiphong Harbor, seem to me most unwise and ill advised.

I should like to quote two statements which were made in the course of the hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill. The first statement was made by Secretary McNamara in response to a question from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] about the desirability of bombing or mining the port of Haiphong.

When the Senator from North Carolina raised the point that the mining of the harbor of Haiphong would cut down the flow of "essential supplies," the Secretary replied, at page 177:

Essential supplies, perhaps, to the economy of North Vietnam, but not essential supplies to the operation in the south.

The tonnage that is required in the south, as I indicated, is relatively small, and it is not necessary for it to come in by port or, for that matter, by railroad or even over automobile roads. It could be carried on the backs of men, as it has been done many times before by the Chinese.

On page 178 of the testimony, in response to a suggestion that it would aid our war effort in the south to bomb the industries in the north, the Secretary testified:

The industries in the north contribute very little to the supplies that are used in the south for the prosecution of the war.

In my opinion, it would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

At page 299 of the record, Admiral McDonald, responding to a question from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], said:

The Vietcong in South Vietnam need few petroleum items because they walk everywhere; they don't need much.

I support the position taken by Admiral McDonald and by Secretary McNamara. I point out the grave danger of changing our policies, as indicated in the columns of Mr. Reston and Mr. Childs.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2669), to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the American people know that no car can be safer than its tires. Yet today, there is deepening public anxiety as to the adequacy both of tires supplied with new cars and of replacement tires purchased in the "after market."

There are, today, 300 million passenger tires in use on the Nation's highways and, as the vast new Interstate Highway System reaches out across our country, these tires are being subjected to punishment of a kind and degree virtually unknown 20 years ago.

Today, station wagons heavily laden with family and baggage customarily speed across hundreds of miles of highway in the heat of summer, at legal speeds up to 80 miles an hour. As car owners, we expect our tires to perform such service safely, though it may be demanded only once or twice a year. We expect such performance from our tires not only when they are new but throughout their tread life. And when we subject millions of worn tires to retreading, we expect the retreaded tires to perform safely throughout yet another tour of service.

At the very time that tires are being subjected to greater and greater stress the so-called cheapie tire—the low-price replacement tire usually sold under the marketer's own unfamiliar brand name—

has captured a substantial share of the replacement tire market.

The committee received disturbing testimony that significant numbers of these tires were of poor quality, often evidencing, upon close inspection, fatal defects and incapable of performing safely under normal conditions of use.

With respect to tires on new cars, our committee received a surprising volume of complaints of unexplained tire blow-outs at mileages as low as 6,000, 5,000, and even 4,000 and 3,000 miles.

One tire manufacturer said:

Over the years, vehicle manufacturers, in an attempt to cut costs, have cut down the amount of tire they are designing on their vehicles.

Some vehicles are overloaded when they are empty of passengers or baggage.

More than 20 percent of the 300 million passenger tires presently in use are retreaded tires, produced in thousands of shops throughout the country. The safety of such tires is subject not only to the strength of the tire carcass—which has already outworn one tread—but to the quality of materials, processing methods, and the maintenance of quality control techniques as well. Yet retreaded tires must be capable to bearing up under the same conditions of use as new tires. The testimony was overwhelming to this effect. There is little doubt that far too many retreaded tires fall short of this mark.

An attempt has been made by both the industry and the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission to develop minimum safe standards for tires but, after 3 days of hearings and after reviewing the extensive hearings conducted by the Federal Trade Commission last year, our committee was convinced that the public today remains inadequately protected against the risks of unsafe tires.

There is great confusion, too, in the marketing of tires. I know of no consumer commodity more sharply characterized by confused and misleading nomenclature than the tire.

Though no uniform grading system presently exists, the great majority of the private label marketers and domestic manufacturers market tires on the basis of an apparent grading system. Thus, "premium," "first line," "second line," and "100 level," imply that an objective grading system exists. Yet these designations today have no uniform fixed meaning or definitive value. One marketer's "premium" is the inferior of another's "third line" tire—and a single manufacturer may market a tire under its own brandname as a "third level" tire while his private label customer markets the same tire as a "first line" tire.

Tires are unlike many consumer items which are bought, rapidly consumed, and bought again. The tire consumer has little opportunity to sample and test for himself the quality of each of the multitude of brands marketed. Fortunately, he need not buy a new set of tires every week.

In summary, the bill, as reported by the committee:

First. Directs the Secretary of Commerce, on or before January 31, 1967, to

March 25, 1966

denced as early as 1962 by his "Big City Report." He realizes, as we must, that the old line Democratic city organizations are unable to cope with the increasing problems of our ever-expanding cities. A void in leadership exists. It is our duty to fill this void by concerning ourselves with this area which we have traditionally shunned. For we now know that Republicans can win in the cities, John Lindsay and JACOB JAVITS, carried the city of New York. Edward Brooke carried the city of Boston. There are Republican mayors in Louisville, Akron, and Honolulu. And in 1960 Richard Nixon clearly would have been elected President if we had devoted more of our efforts to city organization. Yes, the opportunity is there. We must seize the initiative.

We owe it to our country as well as our party to once more become a potent political power, offering a constructive, forward looking, progressive program, which reflects the needs of the people and builds for the future generations. We must truly offer the voter a choice. It is our duty as a major political party. Indeed the basis of this country's political heritage has always been a strong two-party system—an incumbent party and a constructive opposition. And it is here that we have failed. We have been an opposition which merely opposes. We must instead offer constructive alternatives and, even more, initiate positive programs where the administration has failed to act.

We see that the national Democratic Party, in its frantic drive for "government by consensus" has been attempting to make "docile instruments" of the American people. The President, in both his foreign and domestic policy, has made it quite clear that docility is one of the qualities he cherishes most among his subjects. And yet such a policy is alien to the American tradition. Our great nation was born through a revolution that has seen the establishment of a democratic society, the dynamic growth of industry, the tremendous advances of science and technology. We have always taken the bold step forward, shown the way, set the pace for the other nations to follow in the areas of social, economic and political development. It is all of this which the administration's policies will change. For as John Stuart Mill wrote, "A state which dwarfs its men, in order that they be more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

Therefore, I call upon the Republican Party to change all this. We have a sacred responsibility to the American people to be the voice of intelligent and constructive opposition. There is plenty wrong in the world and within the United States, problems not being solved by the Johnson administration. Surely we have the ingenuity and leadership to offer something better.

And so it is incumbent upon us, as Republicans, to nominate candidates who can and will win by carrying forth the true message of a vital, dynamic and aggressive party. And what must this message be? It must be that the Republican Party is the forward looking and progressive party, well aware of the needs of the country and well aware of the duties and responsibilities of a government of the people. A party which recognizes the great challenges of the future and is ready to cope with them. A party which continues in the tradition of the Abraham Lincolns, the Theodore Roosevelts, the Dwight Eisenhowers. But though we may look to the past for our heritage, we must look, as we have always done, to the future for ideas.

It is apparent that the Republican Party is facing a great ideological confrontation within its ranks. The result of which will not only determine the future course of our Party, but whether there shall be any future

at all. Let all Republicans, therefore, join in this battle of ideas. Let us set our party on a realistic course, ready to effectively deal with the problems of today and of tomorrow.

In this election year the challenge is again offered us to contest the policies and programs of the Democratic Party. This challenge must be taken up and effectively answered back. I am confident that if we have the wisdom and the willingness to face the problems of our times, that 1966 will hold forth great victories for our party. But to achieve this end, a beginning must be made. The time is now. The place is here. The challenge is yours.

A Tribute to the Late Honorable John F. Baldwin of California

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, of the California 14th District, is a great loss to us all. In life he was recognized as an outstanding leader in his particular field of legislative interest. In death he is remembered with the greatest respect, on both sides of the aisle, as a man of principle and a most competent colleague who has served in six Congresses. And all of us who knew him as a friend and who warmed to the glow of his kind and gracious personality are saddened far beyond mere words.

JOHN BALDWIN made his name in the Congress, and prior to that in 5½ years of service in the U.S. Army, as a finance expert of extraordinary proportions. Having majored in accounting and finance at the University of California, from which he was graduated with honors before obtaining a law degree from the same institution, he was well equipped for the role he chose to play in life. As a lieutenant colonel in World War II, he became Director of Training for the Army Finance School, Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department, and executive officer of the Office of Fiscal Director in the Mediterranean Theater. He was decorated for his services.

In civilian life, JOHN BALDWIN established a thriving law practice in Martinez, Calif., thereby attracting the attention of local political organizations. In 1954 he was nominated for Congress and elected, and the following decade was reelected five times in succession. In the House of Representatives he was named to serve on the Public Works Committee, where he promptly established himself as a financial wizard. At his untimely death during his 51st year, he was the second ranking Republican member on the committee, and greatly admired by all.

With a deep sense of appreciation and respect for this fine man, I salute his name on this occasion, and hail him as a person of great ability and integrity,

who has brought honor to his family, his district, and his country. I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and three daughters.

Appeasement Then: Appeasement Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, some critics of present U.S. policy in Vietnam propose appeasement of Communist China as a means of ending the war in South Vietnam. They fail to see the very clear analogy between bowing to Red China now and yielding to Hitler in the 1930's. A recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer observed:

This kind of thinking springs from stupidity or refusal to face the facts.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEASEMENT THEN: APPEASEMENT NOW

What could turn out to be one of the critical miscalculations of our times is the appeasement of Communist China proposed by critics of U.S. policy, in and out of the Senate, as a means of ending the war in South Vietnam.

Because appeasement became a dirty word when its practitioners paved the way for Hitler's rise, it is the fashion among those who would give in to Mao Tse-tung to insist that there is no analogy between bowing obediently to Red China now and yielding to Hitler in the 1930's.

They say that the Nazis were bent on expansion and conquest, whereas the Chinese Reds are so preoccupied with domestic problems that they can't concern themselves with territorial aggrandizement, even if they had the capability for it.

This kind of thinking springs from stupidity or refusal to face the facts. To say that a Communist power is unconcerned with "territorial aggrandizement" is to turn resolutely from reality. All that the Communists want is the world. They will, just as the Nazis did, take everything they think they need, and that they can get.

The Russians would be surprised to know that Red China seeks no territorial acquisition, in face of the fact that Peking claims something like 600,000 square miles of Russian geography. The Tibetans would doubtless like to know what Peking's seizure of their homeland can be called if not "aggrandizement," and so would the Indians pushed from their borderland homes by Chinese aggression.

Red China tried to add South Korea to the Communist terrain, just as it is trying to add all of Indochina. It has sought to spread its influence, with varying results, wherever it could gain a toe-hold, from Indonesia to Cuba. One of its avowed purposes is the conquest of Formosa, and the extinction of the island's anti-Communist population.

To yield piecemeal to this insatiable monster, to surrender to it and its puppets the people of South Vietnam in the hopes that it will forever be content, and disturb us no more, is not just wishful thinking: it is suicide.

March 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1731

As we all know, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was to be independent in name only. Domination by the Soviet Union was to be complete.

Nevertheless, despite all Soviet efforts at control, the spirit of independence among the Byelorussian people could not be eradicated. It has remained until this day. And, Mr. Speaker, it is this indomitable spirit of freedom which we today honor in celebrating Byelorussian Independence Day.

The Challenge Is Yours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Jeffrey B. Kimball, legal assistant to Massachusetts Attorney General Edward Brooke, recently gave a most impressive address to the Michigan Young Republican College Convention. He points very clearly to some of the important challenges which face the Republican Party and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE IS YOURS

(Keynote address by Jeffrey B. Kimball, to Michigan Young Republican College Convention, Detroit, Mich., Mar. 11, 1966)

It certainly is a pleasure to have been invited to Michigan again, a State where the Republican Party has been making tremendous gains and setting an example for the rest of the country to follow. You are to be complimented on the outstanding accomplishments of the senior party under Gov. George Romney and State Chairwoman Elly Peterson and on the fine work of your ever-efficient Young Republican organization under Walter Briggs and Jerry Van Wyke. I also wish to convey to you the best wishes and sincere regards of another outstanding Republican for whom it has been my privilege to have been associated with during the past year, the attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke. And we certainly look forward to seeing him join with Congressman Bob GRUFFIN as freshman Senators in Washington next year.

Most of all, however, I appreciate the chance to appear before this great convention because it affords me the opportunity to discuss one of the most pressing problems which we Republicans face—building the future of our party. And it is my hope that today's talk will stimulate increased discussion among all of you in this critical area. For the Republican Party needs nothing so much as it needs debate, criticism, reappraisal, and above all ideas.

The great question confronting us today is not whether there is a need to alter the present direction and image of our party, but rather what is the best method for achieving this goal. For nearly a decade, the Republican Party has slowly been relegating itself to the status of a permanent minority. Unless this trend is quickly stopped and reversed, we may well find ourselves joining the Federalists, the Whigs, and the Mugwumps as forgotten relics of the political past.

Each of us is familiar with the statistics and the records. And, more than alarmed, we should be disgusted with what we read. Every election night since 1958 we have stayed awake, suffering the agony of watching our party incur mounting defeats, until today we have less than a third of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress, less than is necessary to sustain the veto of the Republican President we are unable to elect. We all know the figures, that there are only 17 Republican Governors, that only 5 States have Republican executives and legislatures, that the Republican presidential ticket received less than 40 percent of the vote in 1964, the worst defeat in our party's 108-year history. But even more shocking is the fact that among every economic, religious, and ethnic group, Republican influence has sharply declined. We see this among employers and employees, urban residents and rural farmers, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, college graduates and high school dropouts, white and Negroes, management and labor, among all groups within our society. And it is this across-the-board rejection that we must reverse.

The Republican Party can no longer allow itself and its candidates to continue to campaign against Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal legislation of the 1930's. We can no longer sit by and permit our party to put forth candidates and issues which are out of touch with the present situation and for whom we must constantly apologize. But rather we must begin to accept the realities of today's world and to deal with its existing problems. And yet we continue to meet at party conferences, falsely delude ourselves that we are really in step with the times, and thus practice self-deception by mutual consent.

The year 1966 is the year of opportunity. The Democratic Party has failed to live up to the trust that has been placed in it by the electorate. They have failed to formulate a forward-looking program to deal with future contingencies, preferring the ad hoc approach totally influenced by political considerations. But until we begin to offer constructive alternatives and responsible programs we cannot expect the country to turn to us for leadership. We must take the initiative. We must provide the necessary leadership to move this country constantly forward—the leadership which is presently lacking. Only then can we once more become the majority party.

For too long Republican successes have depended upon passing dissatisfactions with the incumbent Democratic officeholders. What we must seek are permanent victories based upon the voters' confidence in our party, its candidates, its programs, and above all its sincerity.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago, Abraham Lincoln said "If you would win a man to your cause, you must first convince him that you are his sincere friend." And this principle is still valid. For the question which the voter asks and which we must ask of ourselves is what kind of people are we. For the kind of people we Republicans are, far more than the issues and the candidates, determines whether the voter will place his future in our hands. The Republican Party suffered a humiliating defeat in 1964 because the American people questioned our sincerity and our concern in dealing with their problems.

Therefore, let us determine what kind of people are we. For if we Republicans limit our leadership to a select few, how differently, asks the voter, would we govern the country? And if we Republicans allow our policy to be influenced by political extremists how differently, asks the voter, would we govern the country?

Yes, just what kind of people are we? For it is this image we project that determines if the voter will even consider our programs

and candidates. We must convince the electorate that we are concerned, that we truly care. For as Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "What you are speaks so loudly, I cannot hear a word you are saying."

There are Republicans who have convinced the electorate of their sincerity. Republicans in whom the voters have placed their trust—George Romney, Edward Brooke, Mark Hatfield, William Scranton, John Chafee, and James Rhodes. We would do well to take a lesson from them.

And so let us consider at least two proposals on the road to recovery. First, we must once more be the party of inclusion, not exclusion. We must welcome to our ranks all who seek to continue those basic principles upon which our party was founded. More importantly we must actively seek these people out. We must make a plea to the intellectual, to the member of the minority, to the union member, to all whom we have avoided in the past. Only in this way can we become truly a national party, representing the interests of all the people.

Since our inception in 1854, the Republican Party has reflected a hegemony of diverse philosophies, but yet has been held together by one concept—the dignity of the individual and the equality of all men. It was on this principle that the Whigs, Free Soilers, dissident Democrats, and a host of minor parties were able to unite and become the party of inclusion—the Republican Party. It was this principle that dominated our party for the next century, a century which saw forward looking and progressive legislation under 64 years of Republican Presidents and 52 years of Republican Congresses—the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, ending slavery and guaranteeing equal protection of the law to all; the enactment of the civil service system; the trust busting era; the civil rights legislation of 1957 and 1960. And it is only through a continuance in this belief that we can hope to survive the present crisis our party has refused to effectively face. Though the problems which have divided us may be great, the principle which has bound us together is immeasurably stronger.

We must be a national party, the party of all; but we must also be watchful for those who would subvert our purpose and turn us from our goal. We can never be the home of the racist and the bigot. Our heritage and tradition prohibit us from allying with these purveyors of fear, hatred, and terror. We must turn away the John Birchers, the Ku Klux Klan member, the political extremist who would introduce a philosophy alien to our principles. Civil rights and the integrity of the individual are the essence of our belief. They are what the Republican Party is all about.

Secondly, our party must begin to deal with the problems of the metropolitan area. We can no longer limit ourselves to an untenable "Southern strategy." Rather we must devote our efforts to the dynamic problems of the spreading megapolis—no longer a future concept, but a current reality. We must realize that 70 percent of our Nation's population lives in the great urban centers. We must concern ourselves with their problems—mass transportation, slum clearance, job opportunities, and a host of other matters unknown a century ago.

But not only must we address ourselves to these problems, we must also accept that, with the growing complexities of our urban life, there is a definite need and a proper place for Federal assistance. Let me emphasize assistance, not control. We must no longer be afraid of the Federal Government, but rather must work with it, utilizing all of its resources to aid us in building a truly "great society," not a myth for political gain.

Our national chairman, Ray Bliss, has long advocated the Republican Party taking a greater interest in the urban area, as evi-